



THE LONDON BOROUGH  
www.bromley.gov.uk

BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333 CONTACT: Helen Long  
*helen.long@bromley.gov.uk*

DIRECT LINE: 020 8313 4595  
FAX: 020 8290 0608 DATE: 31 January 2012

To: Members of the  
**SCHOOLS' FORUM**

**Primary Maintained School Head Teachers:** Patrick Foley and Fiona Mills

**Primary Academy Head Teacher:** Richard Sammonds

**Secondary Maintained Head Teacher or Governor**

**Secondary Academy Head Teacher:** Karen Raven and

**Primary Maintained Governors:** Geoff Boyd and Angela Chapman

**Primary Academy Governor:** Colin Ashford

**Secondary Academy Governors:** Andrew Downes and David Wilcox

**Special Head Teacher/Governor:** Keith Seed

**Non-School Representatives:** David Bridger (Church of England), Neil Proudfoot (Joint Teacher Liaison Committee), Alison Regester (Early Years) and Anna Boshier (Catholic).

A meeting of the **Schools' Forum** will be held at **Education Development Centre** on **THURSDAY 9 FEBRUARY 2012 AT 4.30 PM** \*

**\* PLEASE NOTE STARTING TIME AND VENUE**

MARK BOWEN  
Director of Resources

## **A G E N D A**

- 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
- 3 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN**
- 4 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 12TH JANUARY 2012**  
To Follow
- 5 THE SCHOOL FUNDING SETTLEMENT FOR 2012/13 USE OF THE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT (Pages 3 - 12)**
- 6 PROPOSED MINIMUM FUNDING GUARANTEE CHANGES FOR 2012/13 (Pages 13 - 18)**
- 7 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**8 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

**All meetings are at the EDC unless otherwise stated.**

**Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> March 2012**

.....

Decision Maker: **Schools Forum**

Date: **9 January 2012**

**TITLE: THE SCHOOL FUNDING SETTLEMENT FOR 2012/13  
USE OF THE DEDICATED SCHOOLS' GRANT**

Contact Officer: David Bradshaw, Head of Children and Young People Finance  
Tel: 020 8313 4807 E-mail: david.bradshaw@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Gillian Pearson, Director of Children and Young People Services

Ward: Boroughwide

---

1. Reason for report

1.1 This report provides an interim update on the usage of the Dedicated Schools' Grant.

---

**2. RECOMMENDATION(S)**

2.1 The Schools Forum is asked to discuss the proposals and provide any comment and consideration for the consultation process.

**3. COMMENTARY**

**3.1 Background**

3.1.1 The Schools Forum report of the 12<sup>th</sup> January 2012 set out the funding of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) and Pupil Premium. The report gave an early indication of how the DSG could be spent and allocated across all services.

3.1.2 This report gives an update on the financial position and allocations and invites comments from the Forum.

3.1.3 It is intended that a final report be brought back to the Forum in March with the proposed allocation of the DSG.

3.1.4 Appendix one shows the current position of the DSG and where allocations are proposed.

3.1.5 Appendices two to five give further details behind these figures.

**4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 These proposals support the delivery of priorities identified in "Securing the best possible future for all children and young people in Bromley", the Children and Young People's Plan 2009-2011.

**5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 These are included in the body of this report.

**6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 The Local Authority is obliged to account for and distribute funding received from central government, for the purposes of education in accordance with the relevant legislative accounting provisions.

6.2 Where the Local Authority seeks to exercise any discretion that it may have on the distribution of funding that is received, it is prudent to consult on the outcomes with all relevant stakeholders.

<b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>	Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	

## USE OF DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT 2012/2013

	£'000	£'000	
<b>Estimated DSG figure ( to be confirmed)</b>		<b>219,469</b>	
Estimated future LACSEG Adjustment		-250	See Note 1
<b>Available DSG</b>		<b>219,219</b>	
Central Schools Budget		35,064	
<b>Delegated Budgets (MFG)</b>			
Primary	71,077		
Secondary	8,352		
Special	10,011		
		89,440	
<b>Academy Recoupment</b>			
SBS Primary	17,156		
SBS Secondary	72,445		
		89,601	
LACSEG Primary	335		
LACSEG Secondary	884		
		1,219	
Contingency		1,000	
Behaviour service - income target		-400	
FLAG - removal		-400	
Other staff costs – reduction in supply cover		-300	
<b>Allocated DSG</b>		<b>215,224</b>	
<b>Unallocated DSG</b>		<b>3,995</b>	
<b>Items for Consideration for unallocated DSG</b>			
Floor area costs - CFC		100	
Funding for bulge classes		150	
SEN		2,200	See Appx 5
Increased Carbon Reduction Contributions		150	
EBD Provision for Primary		290	
Home and Hospital Education		100	
Funding for Early Years PVI payments		470	
Special School Meal Contract		40	
Contribution to Capital/Invest to Save		800	
Balance over allocated		(305)	
		<b>3,995</b>	

**Note 1**

This amount would be held as part of the contingency to mitigate any in year adjustments for further conversions to academies during 2012/13.

**Potential other uses of DSG****Action/Action plus/EAL**

§ Suggested by a member of the Forum – This was investigated by officers – outcome is that these are not recommended as detailed below:

EAL funding is currently allocated to reflect buy back of support from the local authority. Any changes to the current process would require a full consultation process

School Action/Action plus is structured as part of the current banded funding model and any increases to action and action plus could destabilise the balance against the matrix levels.

**Targeted funding for Early Years**

§ Suggested by a member of the Forum – would have a positive impact on performance in the short and long term

§ Needs further investigation with officers as to the potential of this.

§ How would it be targeted? Increase in blanket funding across all settings would not improve performance necessarily – would this need to be focussed on some kind of quality factor?

## FURTHER INFORMATION ON THE USE OF THE DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT

### **Estimated Future LACSEG reduction**

Funding for the schools budget portion of LACSEG will be recovered from LAs' DSG allocations in 2012/13 through recoupment the current methodology including the additional element regarding contingency. This amount allows for future in year academy conversions

### **Central Schools Budget**

This provides for the centrally retained elements of the Schools Budget not delegated to schools. It includes Special Educational Needs, the Behaviour Service, payments to Early Years providers and capital expenditure financed by revenue.

### **Delegated Budgets Minimum Funding Guarantee**

This relates to all maintained schools. The Minimum Funding Guarantee has been adjusted to ensure that no school will have its budget reduced by more than 1.5% per pupil, before the pupil premium is added.

### **Academy recoupment**

This is the amount top sliced from Bromley's DSG which is given to the YPLA to fund Academies. This assumes two Secondaries and three Primaries converting in 2012/13.

### **Contingency**

It is prudent to keep an amount in contingency to cover any unforeseen eventualities and to avoid unnecessary turbulence. Notionally £250k is being set aside for redundancy and retirement costs (as per 2011/12). S251 returns require this to sit in contingency. A further £750k is set aside for final adjustments to DSG once the final pupil numbers are known. Any unused allocation could be used for other purposes.

### **Behaviour service – Income Target**

The behaviour service has been given an income target to sell services to academies. This was not in the budget in 2011/12

### **Flexible Learning Advisory Group (FLAG)**

This expenditure was ceased in the summer of 2011. Therefore the funding available for this activity is released.

### **Other staff cost reductions**

Reduction in costs of supply cover costs due to academy conversions. The funding is released.

### **Floor area costs**

Additional floor area costs in schools with children and family centres attached which will now be run by the school.

### **Funding for bulge classes**

Funding for bulge classes in Primary Schools that will start in September 2012 and will otherwise go unfunded as they will not be picked up in the January 2012 count

### **Special Education Needs**

See Appendix 5.

### **Carbon Reduction Commitment**

The Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC) scheme imposes a statutory duty on the Council to take certain actions in relation to purchasing carbon allowances and reporting on emissions associated with energy use in buildings. The Council is required to bear the cost of administering the CRC scheme and to purchase carbon allowances on behalf of schools. 2011/12 data shows that additional funding will be required to cover the full costs.

**EBD Provision for Primary Girls**

Provision for primary aged EBD children. This provision has been agreed by the executive working group as an invest to save.

**Home and Hospital Education**

Increased provision and costs in this area.

**Early Years funding**

Statutory entitlement to provide sufficient places for all three and four year olds. Predicted increase in costs and entitlement over current budget levels.

**Special School Meal Contract**

Schools meal contract retendered. Additional costs incurred for special schools. Funding needed to meet new contract.

**Contribution to Capital/Invest to Save**

Potential for an invest to save project for Secondary ASD provision. Potential for Government grant to offset some of the build costs. Remaining costs may have to be funded form DSG. Unlikely that this would take effect from 2012/13. However this would need to be built into the budgets in the medium term. In the interim the funding could be allocated to Basic Need projects which would benefit all schools including Academies.

Has the [potential to help negate ongoing pressures in SEN by diverting costly out of borough placements into in borough provision.

**Balance over allocated**

This would need to be balanced off to get DSG expenditure in line with the overall allocation.



## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

Pressures on the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities budget arise from the remarkable advances in medical science of the last decade resulting in more children with the most serious and multiple disabilities surviving birth and living longer. Thus the resource requirements for complex special educational needs require growth to meet the special educational needs, health and social needs of the child and his/her family. This trend is demonstrated locally (see Pre-School Specialist Support Audit).

Special Educational Needs and Disability Service spend has increased due to the numbers of children with severe and complex special educational needs entering the statutory school system. Increase in spend can be identified in independent day placements, increase costs of matrix and costs of alternative programmes (reduction in funded pupil numbers and increase in unit cost). There is also an increase in the volume of statements of SEN in 2012 compared to 2011. This bid for an increase in budget aims to identify and take action to address this demand and meet needs within borough wherever possible.

Children born and surviving with a greater level of complex needs have increased nationally and locally and are entering the education system. (Pre-school Specialist Support Services Audit p4) highlights this increase in volume (from 2005-2011) of an extra 89 children with highly complex SEN have been identified in the London Borough of Bromley. Educational placement for these children is predicted to be costly due to the need for smaller class ratios and/or small group or 1:1 intervention required to meet needs. This is reflected in the higher level of matrix spend in primary provision and increase in specialist places.

Whilst the new Riverside, Beckenham ASD Provision has helped to alleviate the pressure on pupils with ASD requiring out of borough provision, there is still a need for provision for secondary school pupils with severe social communication difficulties (ASD/Aspergers) and those with Social and Emotional Behaviour Difficulties (SEBD) where the local authority often have to resort to expensive out-borough placements, when mainstream options are not appropriate to meet needs. The Member Officer Working Party for SEN is currently considering the development of in-borough provision to meet this demand.

### Management Controls - Statutory Assessment of SEN

There continues to be stringent control mechanisms in place to ensure that schools utilise the resources they have available to them both from within their own budgets. Scrutiny of interventions at school level are undertaken regularly and skilled outreach support professionals are used to challenge and support schools in meeting needs. All schools and settings are expected to follow the 4 stage process laid out in the Department for Education (DfE) guidelines – “The SEN Code of Practice.” Bromley SEN Services have written guidelines/thresholds for all schools and settings. Thresholds are monitored through an annual audit of all special schools and specialist provisions.

When a school or parent/carer request that the local authority makes a statutory assessment the Local Authority Moderating Panel (consisting of professionals from a range of agencies ensuring a check and balance and consistency across the local authority) assess the level of difficulty a child may have. They also ensure interventions have taken place by the school, assess whether the school have exhausted the use of additional local resources and whether the child meets the threshold for a statutory assessment (as laid out in the SEN Code of Practice). This ensures consistency of decision-making.

Equally additional support without recourse to a statement has a robust system of interrogation and is subject to agreement by the multi-agency Specialist Support and Disability Panel chaired by the Head of Service. It is only agreed for a limited period subject to a review. This process provides carefully planned resource without the bureaucracy of a statement and is reviewed regularly in a formal manner allowing changes to be made to the provision without having to change the contents of a Statement. Thus not obliging the LA to be tied in to what is sometimes support for the duration of the child's schooling. Also it ensures that the resource is provided when it is needed and not four to six months after identifying the needs as is the case for a Statement of SEN.

If a residential placement is felt to be needed to due to very complex needs/circumstances this is subject to the approval of both the Assistant Director for Social Care and Safeguarding and the Assistant Director Access and Inclusion via a Complex Case Panel. Independent day placements in out of borough schools require the approval of the Interim Assistant Director Education.

## PRE-SCHOOL SPECIALIST SUPPORT SERVICES AUDIT AUTUMN 2011

<b>Children with Profound Severe or Very Complex Needs</b>	<b>Destinations</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
Profound and multiple learning difficulties including complex medical needs (PMLD)	Riverside/Orpington	28	24	36	39
Severe learning difficulties (SLD)	Riverside/Orpington/ units attached to mainstream	38	43	46	45
Sensory support (SS)	HIU Unit (Darrick Wood)or mainstream with support	20	35	40	41
Severe or profound social communication difficulties/ASD (SSCD)	Riverside Orpington/ Beckenham/units attached to mainstream	55	68	87	84
Speech and language difficulties (SpALD)	Language Units (Green Street Green/Raglan) or mainstream with support	78	69	70	95
Physical difficulties (PD)	Marjorie McClure or mainstream with support	22	17	20	18
Behaviour, emotional and social difficulties (BESD)	M/S with support/Nuture Provision Manor Oak	5	14	10	13
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>246</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>335</b>

The table above shows the growth of numbers of children with complex special educational needs between 2005-2011. Between 2010-2011, there has been an increase of 26 children at pre school level identified with complex and enduring needs who require specialist provision.

## GROWTH BID FOR SEN RELATED AREAS USING DSG

Item for Growth	Funded Pupil Numbers or Places	Budget for 2011/12 £	Budget you are anticipating for 2012/13 £	Funded Pupil Numbers or Places	Growth Bid Required £
Transport contractors -DSG (Riverside Beck and Hayes DSG)		90,000	320,000		230,000
SEN Matrix	915.6	7,253,985	7,831,449	1,014	577,464
SEN Independent Day	112.0	3,866,300	4,573,158	130	706,858
SEN Independent Boarding	84.3	5,823,680	5,637,759	83	-185,921
Alternative Provision	79.9	600,520	740,378	83	139,858
Maintained Day	50.5	1,125,720	1,228,809	57	103,089
Maintained Boarding	13.2	599,610	713,470	16	113,860
Support in Mainstream	124.3	1,056,350	957,033	111	-99,317
Equipment		14,000	14,000		0
Contingency added to Budget		500,000	0		-500,000
Development of 8 Key Stage 1 Placements (Crofton) 7/12 only		0	63,467		63,467
Development of 6 Key Stage 2 Placements (Riverside) 7/12 only		0	77,000		77,000
Increase of place led funding for unit provisions (complexity of need)		0	50,000		50,000
Grovelands Development		0	70,000		70,000
Sub Total		20,930,165	22,276,523		1,346,358
Primary provision for children with complex needs		0	200,000		200,000
Speech and Language Contracts		65,160	311,166		246,006
Health Needs without Recourse to statements		181,000	346,000		165,000
Sub Total		246,160	857,166		611,006
Pupil Resource Agreements		130,000	286,000		156,000
Transition for PRA		0	80,000		80,000
Sub Total		130,000	366,000		236,000
Total		21,306,325	23,499,689		2,193,364

Report No.  
DCYP12018

London Borough of Bromley

Agenda  
Item No. **6**

PART 1 - PUBLIC

---

Decision Maker: **Schools Forum**

Date: **9 February 2012**

TITLE: **PROPOSED MINIMUM FUNDING GUARANTEE CHANGES FOR 2012/13**

Contact Officer: Mandy Russell, Head of Schools' Finance Team  
Tel: 020 8313 4806 E-mail: amanda.russell@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Gillian Pearson, Director of Children and Young People Services

Ward: Boroughwide

---

1. Reason for report

- 1.1 This report provides information on the proposed changes to the Minimum Funding Guarantee for individual schools in 2012/13.
- 

2. **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 **The Schools Forum is asked to minute their support of the proposed changes as required by DfE as part of the application for approval from the Secretary of State.**

3. **COMMENTARY**

- 3.1 The 2011/12 school funding announcement on 13 December 2010 included arrangements for variations to the Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG). Schools' Forums no longer have the general power to approve variations to the MFG affecting schools covering no more than 50% of pupils in the Authority. However, variations can still be applied without reference to the Secretary of State where:

- a variation to the coverage of the MFG (i.e. the list of exceptions in the regulations which are outside its scope) has previously been approved by the Schools' Forum or Secretary of State and did not have a specified time limit;
- the proposed variation applies to the implementation of the early years single funding formula in isolation;
- the proposed variation would result in a higher level of MFG than -1.5% (for example – 1% per pupil);
- the proposed variation relates only to the Diploma formula grant.

- 3.2 All other proposals need to be approved by the Secretary of State. Proposals will be reviewed on a weekly basis, and should include the rationale for the proposal, evidence of support from the Schools' Forum and full details of the financial effect on individual schools if the MFG was disappplied and, in particular, evidence that this is not counteracting the additionality of the pupil premium. Full details of the DfE guidelines are attached at **Appendix 1**.
- 3.3 For 2012/13 it is proposed that this should be extended further. To allow LAs to agree disapplications locally, subject to School Forum approval, where the Secretary of State had agreed these unconditionally in 2011-12 and where they relate to factors where disapplications were consistently approved in 2011-2. These include Advanced Skills Teachers, SEN Units and site/school specific factors where the school's circumstances had changed. Also to introduce an additional safeguard so that the continuation of exemptions agreed in previous years could only happen where the method of calculating the formula factor had not changed. This would protect schools more effectively against the effect of formula changes.
- 3.4 Having looked at the early budget projections for 2012/13 there are a number of schools where the MFG is considerably higher than the formula calculation where the LA would seek permission from the Secretary of State to adjust the MFG. Full details of the financial implications is attached at **Appendix 2**. The reasons for the proposed changes are outlined below:
- Additional MFG - Bishop Justus School ( Academy)  
Up to 2010/11 the school was still considered to be an opening school and was in receipt of additional funding generated by the MFG. It was agreed with the Schools Forum that this funding should be phased out once the school was fully open so that the school would be funded on the basis of the formula funding only to bring it in line with other schools. Funding was being phased out in 2009/10 and 2010/11 with the final amount of £200k to be removed in 2011/12, in full agreement of the school. In 2011/12 Schools Forum was no longer allowed to agree this adjustment so application was made to the Secretary of State. This was refused on the grounds that this would have a serious impact on the school concerned.  
  
The LA is requesting that this being given serious consideration again this year on the basis that the school should be funded in line with other schools, and that this would release a large amount of funding which could then be used to benefit all schools.
  - Foundation/VA Factor  
To reflect real reduction in formula funding for Foundation/ Voluntary Aided Schools element for which these schools are no longer eligible since becoming academies.  
  
**NB:** This falls within the examples of not needing approval from Secretary of State but is included for Schools' Forum information only.
  - Insurance  
To reflect the removal of insurance funding from the funding formula as this is now claimed directly from the YPLA.  
  
**NB:** This falls within the examples of not needing approval from Secretary of State but is included for Schools' Forum information only.

- **Small Schools**  
These are all small schools where increases in pupil numbers over the last few years have resulted in the MFG increasing at a disproportionate rate to the funding formula each year, with these increases being compounded year upon year. This has also resulted in most of these schools building up significant balances. However, as the LA recognises that the full amount could be too much for a school to lose in any one year, we are proposing to make a 50% adjustment in 2012/13 and again in the following year, if this fits in with the government's new proposals.
- **Bulge Class Funding**  
In 2011/12 a number of schools were asked to open additional bulge classes to accommodate additional reception pupils which generated additional funding. Where this was a one off, i.e. not replicated in 2012/13, this funding does not appear in the formula and therefore needs to be removed from the MFG.

**NB:** This falls within the examples of not needing approval from Secretary of State but is included for Schools' Forum information only.

- 3.5 Any funding that is agreed by the Secretary of State to be removed from individual schools will be recycled across all schools through the funding formula. All calculations are based on indicative figures which could be subject to change when the figures are finalised and therefore it is proposed that the agreement should be given in principle.
- 3.6 The Schools Forum is asked to minute their support of these proposals as required as part of DfE procedures. If the proposed changes are agreed by the Secretary of State, all changes will also be agreed by the CYP Portfolio Holder.

<b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>	Policy, Financial, Legal and Personnel Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	

## MFG Disapplications

Variations to the MFG can be agreed locally without reference to the Secretary of State where:

- A variation to the **coverage** of the MFG (the list of exceptions in the regulations which are outside its scope) has previously been approved by the schools forum or Secretary of State and did not have a specified time limit. If it applied only to 2011-2012, for example, then a new application would need to be made. Variations to the **level** of the MFG which were for more than one year would not remain in place but would require a new application to the Secretary of State;
- the Secretary of State had agreed a variation unconditionally in 2011-2012;
- The proposed variation applies to the implementation of the early years single funding formula in isolation. It would therefore have to apply only to schools with early years provision;
- The proposed variation would result in a higher level of MFG than minus1.5% (for example, minus1% per pupil);
- The proposed variation relates to a factor for advanced skills teachers (ASTs);
- The proposed variation relates to place-led funding for special units;
- The proposed variation relates to exceptional site or school specific factors (for example a split site or new school) where the school's circumstances which attracted the factor have changed;
- The proposed variation relates only to the Diploma formula grant, which was paid to schools based on actual numbers taking Diplomas.

Please note that, in the case of previous approvals by the schools forum or Secretary of State, these can only be rolled forward where the method of calculating that formula factor has not changed.

All other proposals will need to be approved by the Secretary of State. The process for this is that these will be reviewed on a weekly basis. Applications will need to be submitted by **noon on Wednesday each week, from 4 January 2012**, to Keith Howkins (keith.howkins@education.gsi.gov.uk). We would hope to be able to inform LAs of the decision by the **following Wednesday**. There is no standard format for applications, but at a minimum the application should include:

- The rationale for the proposal;
- Evidence of support from schools forums;
- Full details of the financial effect on individual schools if the MFG was disapplied and, in particular, evidence that this is not counteracting the additionality of the Pupil Premium;
- Where the request is for a lower MFG, or for a significant disapplication of the MFG relating to formula reviews or mainstreaming of grants, full details of proposed local protection arrangements and the extent of support from schools, particularly from those which would potentially lose the most.

We set out in the note accompanying the consultation on the School Finance Regulations a summary of what was and was not approved last year, and would urge local authorities to bear this in mind when submitting applications.



School Name	School Type	Amount	% of SBS	Reason
Bishop Justus School	Academy	£202,000	4%	Phase out of additional support to opening school
Bullers Wood School	Academy	£24,186	0.5%	Foundation/ VA factor
Charles Darwin School	Academy	£24,472	0.5%	Foundation/ VA factor
Harris Beckenham	Academy	£20,338	0.5%	Foundation/ VA factor
Harris Bromley	Academy	£14,973	0.4%	Foundation/ VA factor
Hayes School	Academy	£26,385	0.5%	Foundation/ VA factor
Langley Park Boys School	Academy	£23,285	0.5%	Foundation/ VA factor
Langley Park Girls School	Academy	£26,363	0.5%	Foundation/ VA factor
Newstead Wood	Academy	£15,061	0.5%	Foundation/ VA factor
Ravensbourne School	Academy	£24,318	0.5%	Foundation/ VA factor
Ravens Wood School	Academy	£24,494	0.5%	Foundation/ VA factor
Bullers Wood School	Academy	£24,078	0.5%	Insurance
Charles Darwin School	Academy	£19,723	0.4%	Insurance
Harris Beckenham	Academy	£19,361	0.4%	Insurance
Harris Bromley	Academy	£15,318	0.4%	Insurance
Hayes School	Academy	£23,053	0.5%	Insurance
Langley Park Boys School	Academy	£27,445	0.5%	Insurance
Langley Park Girls School	Academy	£25,324	0.5%	Insurance
Newstead Wood	Academy	£19,637	0.4%	Insurance
Ravensbourne School	Academy	£18,281	0.4%	Insurance
Ravens Wood School	Academy	£15,395	0.4%	Insurance
Royston Primary School	Maintained	£62,064	3%	Bulge class funding
Stewart Fleming School	Academy	£38,215	3%	Bulge class funding
Chelsfield Primary School	Maintained	£16,000	3.5%	50% of additional small school funding generated by MFG
Cudham Primary School	Maintained	£22,000	4.5%	50% of additional small school funding generated by MFG
Dorset Road Infant School	Maintained	£18,000	5%	50% of additional small school funding generated by MFG
Manor Oak Primary School	Maintained	£33,000	3%	50% of additional small school funding generated by MFG
Pratts Bottom Primary School	Maintained	£13,000	3.5%	50% of additional small school funding generated by MFG
		£835,769		

This page is left intentionally blank